Selby Creek Stream Habitat Restoration and Riparian Revegetation Project

Kathleen K. Martin

Initial Selection Panel Review

0030

Selby Creek Stream Habitat Restoration and Riparian Revegetation Project

Bioengineering Institute

Applicant amount requested: **$**475,000

Fund This Amount: $**475,000**

The Panel recognized that this proposal is for a project in a priority area for the PSP. The proposal uses an experienced team and the proposed restoration targets priority species. All in all, the proposal seems to be going in the right direction; however, there are weaknesses. The Panel will reconsider this proposal if it is revised to address the following weaknesses: a conceptual model needs to be more clearly articulated (consider using flow model for this); the monitoring plan needs further development including hypothesis-testing (There seems to be the opportunity to perform hypothesis testing on what practices are appropriate and the proponent should take advantage of this opportunity); performance measures should be developed (It is not appropriate to measure the success of the project based on the number of tasks completed); a rationale for the vegetation plan needs to be provided; the outreach plan needs to be strengthened; and greater budget detail needs to be provided. The proposal should also provide a description of how other farmers will be motivated to participate.

Reconsider if Revised

Technical Panel Review

Proposal Name: Selby Creek Stream Habitat Restoration and Riparian Revegetation Project

Applicant Organization: Bioengineering Institute

Amount Requested: $475,000

Panel Rating:
Fair – Lacking in one or more critical aspects

Panel Summary

The panel felt that this proposal has one or more sound or worthy concepts. Based on its technical merits, however, this proposal is lacking in one or more critical aspects and should not be funded in its current form. The proposed project addresses important issues of stream stabilization and vegetation restoration along Selby Creek.

The proposed project builds on a well-networked group with great partnerships and local stakeholders to address an entire section of a stream. However, the site-specificity of the study and lack of monitoring detail were of significant concern to the panel, and as written the proposal lacks sufficient detail to yield information of sufficient value to CALFED or its stakeholders. The proposal describes specific problems and techniques for solving them, but is not adequately rigorous in its adaptive management approach, conceptual model, or proposed monitoring. Methods are not provided in a systematic way.

The information and knowledge generated by the project could be improved by hypothesis testing linked into a well-designed monitoring program. The authors do not demonstrate a good understanding of the ecosystem within which the stream exists, and do not demonstrate the project's applicability to management of other streams/regions. The vegetation component in particular could be strengthened. Some panelists felt that this project could be very valuable, particularly in terms of on-site habitat restoration, but it was very poorly written

and difficult to decipher.

External Technical Review #1

Proposal Number: 0030

Proposal Name: Selby Creek Stream Habitat Restoration and Riparian Revegetation Project

Applicant Organization: Bioengineering Institute

Amount Requested: $475,000

Goals

Rating	**excellent**
Comments	**The proposal does an excellent job clearly and concisely describing the degraded physical and biological conditions in Selby Creek, and sets out a well-organized list of goals and objectives designed to enhance and restore the stream channel and associated habitats. The project has a clear link to ERP goals of restoring habitat for listed salmonids. The quality of the proposal, however, is distracted by the attempts to link the project to benefits to species that are clearly outside the range of the project area. For example, the proposal suggest that the project may benefit a long list of valley and foothill riparian species that do not occur in the project vicinity such as riparian brush rabbit, slough thistle, giant garter snake, or are highly unlikely to occupy habits restored by the project, such as bank swallow and western yellow-billed cuckoo.** **Despite what appears to be a lack of input from a qualified wildlife biologist, the overall proposal has clearly stated objectives with specific, tangible deliverables and measurable outcomes. The proposal has not clearly described how it will assist farmers in integrating agricultural activities with ecosystem restoration. However, the proposal states that it has the clear, explicit support and of the all private**

	landowners in the watershed, and has provided a plan on how to incorporate land owners into site specific restoration actions, such as weeding and irrigation, planting, and monitoring and maintenance of channel structures. So while it is not clear exactly what scope of work the landowners would accomplish in this partnership, the proposal lends confidence that the project will have active, involved commitments from agricultural operators.

Justification And Conceptual Model

Rating	**very good**
Comments	**The proposal has a clear, well-articulated conceptual model. The project's problem statements and proposed technical solutions appear to be thought out systematically and provide creative, integrated methods at restoring structural and biological components of the stream system. An impressive amount of work has already been completed in developing community support, surveying existing environmental solutions, and preparing specific prescriptions to be implemented. While the proposal makes clear that past land use practices lead to much of the observed degradation of the stream system, the suggested links between farm health and ecosystem function are little more than an unsupported assertion. The connections between bank stability and floodplain processes and farm land are clear, tangible, and direct examples of how restoring natural conditions of the stream could benefit farms. However, beyond this direct geomorphic and hydrological link, the biological and functional relationships with agricultural operations are simply not well described.** **The geomorphic and hydrologic aspects of the proposal offer opportunities to directly test hypotheses through data collection during post-construction monitoring. Observing and measuring sedimentation and erosion at different levels of discharge could provide a wealth of data for making any modifications or**

	remedial measures to the project sites in the future, and for applying to similar watersheds in the vicinity. The proposed actions and data collecting could be applied in a useful adaptive management framework. Unfortunately, the projects technical solutions have outpaced its monitoring and adaptive management planning. An early task described on p. 6 is to establish parameters and performance criteria for a monitoring program. These criteria and monitoring methods could and should be developed prior to funding construction of the project. The monitoring methods, metrics, and performance criteria should be directly linked to each proposed structural solution and habitat restoration site, and then a clear data reporting and communication plan should be in place.

Approach

Rating	**very good**
Comments	**The approach of the project is described well and appears to be very appropriate for meeting project objectives. The scale of the geomorphic solutions seems very appropriate to the scale of the degradation. I sincerely question, however, the revegetation plans. The proposal states that over 24 acres, 350 trees, 1,380 shrubs, and 1,000 subshrubs would be planted. This is a potentially severe underplanting of a riparian corridor or at least an entire order of magnitude. While some of the biotechnical bank solutions include live willow wattles or other live woody vegetation, this is not clearly articulated in the proposal as contributing towards the overall vegetative cover goals. It would greatly help the approach if the vegetative cover goals were clearly articulated and accounted for in both biotechnical bank stabilization sites as well as locations with revegetation only. As it reads currently, the revegetation may be severely underscoped.**

	Another aspect of the revegetation approach that may need revision is that several species appear to be omitted from the planting palette. For example, bay tree, arroyo willow, big−leaf maple, cottonwood, elderberry, California blackberry, wild grape, and manzanita all occur presently along Selby Creek, but none have been selected for revegetation. **The overall approach for public outreach and education appears to be well−developed and builds on the years of experience in the watershed. The project is likely to result in providing farmers, the public and cooperating agencies useful information on how to integrate landowners in restoration projects, as well as in the specific technical aspects of revegetation and geomorphic structural solutions in streams. As stated above, however, it would be useful to more clearly and thoroughly articulate specific monitoring and reporting deliverables that outlines specific data to be collected and distributed.**

Feasibility

Rating	**very good**
Comments	**The project has sound technical feasibility. The level of detail and thoroughness on the proposed technical and revegetation solutions suggests that the proposal team is familiar with the environmental conditions and range of potential solutions to be applied. With the possible exception above about the apparently very low number of plants proposed to be installed, I have no concerns that the technical aspects of the project can be implemented successfully. I question, however, the completeness of the regulatory and permitting framework that has been presented. The proposal suggests that NEPA would not be required, but clearly the project would require Sec. 404 permitting, and perhaps Sec. 7 or 10 consultation for listed salmonids. While the**

	proposals states that the project may be included under a regional programmatic general permit, it would give me more confidence if the scope and applicability of that general permit and its conditions were thoroughly described. Prior to funding the project, it would be very important to demonstrate the project falls within those general permit conditions in terms of scope, location, and schedule, and that all aspects of the proposed project, including the types and extent of excavation and fill in the channel, grading, invasive plant removal techniques (especially proposed herbicide uses), and other physical actions would be fully permitted.

Performance Evalutation

Rating	**fair**
Comments	**The proposal does not offer a plan for performance evaluation or an explanation of the criteria that will be used for hypothesis testing. What it offers is more of a promise to develop and monitoring plan that would presumably include analysis, hypothesis testing, and reporting. The nature of the proposed actions lends themselves to the development of project−specific performance measures. Prior to funding, a specific data collection, analysis, performance criteria, and reporting plan should be developed and articulated. Details in the plan could be modified as necessary as the project is built and site specific designs are modified with field conditions, but the overall long−term monitoring procedures should be in place prior to construction so that there is clear direction in the collection of pre−project baseline environmental condition data.**

Proposed Outcomes

Rating	**fair**

Comments	The physical and biological work products have great potential to be successful with the Selby Creek watershed, and lessons and techniques learned from the project could be applied to myriad other streams in agricultural landscapes in the state. The proposal lacks, however, a clear indication as to the type of knowledge that would be developed and how it would be communicated and disseminated. As described above, prior to implementation the project should develop a detailed and specific monitoring, analysis, and reporting plan. This will serve the project in the collection of useful pre-project conditions, as well as to refine and focus the purpose, need, and objective of each project action. So the development of a detailed monitoring will help the project applicants as well as others working in the same field.

Capabilities

Rating	excellent
Comments	The proposal team appears to be highly qualified to accomplish the project. They clearly bring years of field experience and familiarity with the watershed, stakeholders, and individual land owners, as well as the technical aspects of the proposed work. The proposal clearly builds on previous work assessing watershed conditions and working with the community, and has a well-developed capacity to complete the project.

Cost-Benefits

Rating	very good
Comments	The proposed budget is reasonable for the work. It may be on the low end and an underestimate of the actual costs to implement the work. However, if considerable

	landowner inputs are realized in terms of extensive in-kind services, the proposed budget may be adequate to complete the work. It is difficult to make a final determination of the costs because of the unknown amounts and types of matching services to be provided by landowners. The depth and breadth of project experience by the proposal team is manifested in the substantial amounts of matching funding presented in the budget. The proposed project is clearly part of an ongoing larger program, and it appears that CalFed's investment has potential to have substantially greater returns based on the committed matching funding available and existing program infrastructure that will be utilized to complete the project.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating

Rating	**excellent**
Comments	**Overall the proposal is impressive in its scopes, thoroughness, and detail. The text has many unfortunate and distracting problems with formatting, punctuation, and grammar, but superficial problems aside the proposal appears to offer a well-organized, well-thought project with clear goals and objectives and a highly qualified team and committed group of agricultural operators. Applied and installed well, the proposed actions can be very elegant solutions to the problems of degraded stream channels, and I would look forward to seeing this project built. The missing piece remains a clear monitoring and reporting plan. Such a plan would be invaluable not only for a scientific adaptive management framework for long-term follow up in the project area, but could also serve as an immensely useful tool for other projects involving small streams in agricultural landscapes. Such geographical settings really offer some of the greatest potential for restoration of habitats throughout the CalFed program area in the Central Valley and foothills, so the promise of the production and dissemination of a salient monitoring report I would expect to be well-received and well-utilized.**

External Technical Review #2

Proposal Number: 0030

Proposal Name: Selby Creek Stream Habitat Restoration and Riparian Revegetation Project

Applicant Organization: Bioengineering Institute

Amount Requested: $475,000

Goals

Rating	**excellent**
Comments	**The problem statement and project goals and objectives are very thorough. The force justification of the proposal makes this a difficult read.**

Justification And Conceptual Model

Rating	**fair**
Comments	**The project applicant may not have understood what was being asked here in the grant guidelines. It is very clear the project team knows precisely what they plan to do, where it will be done, and the methods they intend to use. A diagram of the project process would be helpful to explain the steps they intend to take and how they are interrelated. The applicant is not testing a hypotheses and they have not identified a pilot study, but rather a full-scale implementation project spread out over several years. They do mention an Adaptive Management strategy and they understand what the purpose of adaptive manangement is. Again, this would be more clear if illustrated in a flow diagram.**

Approach

Rating	**excellent**

Comments	**This proposal team has a very clear and well defined approach and understands how to integrate design and planning with landowner cooperation and broader community outreach.**

Feasibility

Rating	**excellent**
Comments	**The feasibility of the project appears very high. The project team has a well defined methodology and approach as well as a 10 monitoring plan.**

Performance Evalutation

Rating	**very good**
Comments	**The project proponents propose photo station monitoring, survival and species counts, and sediment quantification as measures for success. The proponent has also identified expected outcomes and identifies adaptive management as a strategy for refining restoration measures implemented at sites later in the project timeline. The proponent has also identified that landowners will be involved in future management and implementation of project modifications if needed as sites are monitored and not meeting goals and objectives.**

Proposed Outcomes

Rating	**very good**
Comments	**The techniques proposed in this project have been used elsewhere by the project proponents and others in the restoration community. They have identified proposed outcomes. They have identified a strong public/community/ landowner outreach program to share information and celebrate success over time.**

Capabilities

Rating	very good
Comments	The project team appears well balanced and supported by local agencies.

Cost−Benefits

Rating	very good
Comments	The budget for this effort is healthy and the project proponent has done a good job identifying other sources of fundin inclueind in−kind services and cash contributions from the participating landowners. They have also identified the need for and potential sources of future funding.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating

Rating	excellent
Comments	Overall this proposal is excellent. The project proponent has developed a comprehensive program to restore Selby Creek and link the efforts to ecosystem restoration, cooperation with landwners and incorporation of ecosystem function into local agricultural management. It also has a comprehensive education and public outreach program. The matching funds are significant − especially direct cash contributions by the landowners. In the future the project proponent could be more concise in the written proposal (more is not better), use diagrams and bullet text to highlight key components of the proposal, and learn how to properly format text for maximum legibility. The content is excellent − it is just poorly presented.

External Technical Review #3

Proposal Number: 0030

Proposal Name: Selby Creek Stream Habitat Restoration and Riparian Revegetation Project

Applicant Organization: Bioengineering Institute

Amount Requested: $475,000

Goals

Rating	**excellent**
Comments	**Yes to all of the above. The proposers seem to have done good job of integrating local farmers along the stream into the project, and taking account of their concerns (Pierce's Disease, flooding).**

Justification And Conceptual Model

Rating	**good**
Comments	**The authors seem to have a conceptual model, but it is not well laid out. They pay lip service to the idea that "a balanced ecological system with healthy streams and riparian areas will result in healthy farms and communities", but then jump(p. 6) right away into site-specific detail. I would like to see some discussion (maybe in diagram form) of a geomorphic/hydrologic/vegetation model, showing the interrelationships between riparian vegetation, woody debris, channel velocity, hydraulic complexity, channel incision, bank erosion, flood frequency, flood plain connectivity, fish habitat, overland flow, watershed sediment inputs, stream temperature, invasive species, beneficial/destructive insect habitat,**

	happy fish, and happy farmers. This could be done with a simple box diagram, with arrows (labeled + or −) indicating positive or negative relationships and feedbacks. A long narrative is not necessary. All of these factors are alluded to in the site−specific details. **I don't think that this is a "fatal flaw" in the proposal.**

Approach

Rating	**excellent**
Comments	**Yes, to all of the above. The involvement of local landowners in the project is one of its strengths. The project should have good demonstration value as well as directly improving habitat.** **The environmental education component is also a major benefit of this project, and will help integrate the project into the community.** **I would like to see more front−end involvement by Matt O'Connor in the project. I note that he is only budgeted for $15k. More involvement on his part in writing the proposal might have addressed the weakness in the model, noted above.**

Feasibility

Rating	**very good**
Comments	**Yes, I think this project is technically feasible, with high likelihood of success (though there are always risks in working on streams of extreme events−−flood, drought and fire).**

	The problem of permitting controlled burning does not seem to have been addressed. I assume that CDF, Air Quality Control Dist., and County permits will all be required. There may be significant insurance and liability issues that will have to be addressed. I think the project could proceed w/o controlled burning, if need be.

Performance Evalutation

Rating	very good
Comments	Yes, a monitoring plan is included, but some of the details have not yet been worked out. I don't see reference to monumented channel cross-sections for re-surveying, for example. Yearly vegetation up-dates are planned for five years, even though funding would only run for three years. Long-term monitoring of both channel change and vegetation is very important. The proponants apparently are thinking of future funding sources, which (given the involvement of several agencies in the project) is probably realistic.

Proposed Outcomes

Rating	excellent
Comments	The likely outcomes include: 1) a restored channel w/healthy riparian vegetation and ecological functions; 2) improved long-term management by riparian owners/farmers; 3) demonstration and dissemination of values and techiques of integrated management; 4) environmental education of kids. Data will be stored electronically, and data and reports will be distributed in both electronic and hard copies.

Capabilities

Rating	excellent
Comments	The team clearly has the experience and expertise necessary to pull this off. The project leader

	(Engber) has years of experience with bioengineering on North Coast streams, and an excellent reputation. I am pleased to see that O'Connor is involved; his involvement should be increased.

Cost−Benefits

Rating	**excellent**
Comments	**Yes, the budget, though large, seems realistic and adequate for the work proposed.** **I note that the budget spreadsheet and task narrative do not correspond. It looks like Task 1 and Task 2 in the spreadsheet should be combined as Task 1. The spreadsheet should include task titles. Formatting of the narrative (especially subheadings) is confusing, but not incomprehensible.**

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating

Rating	**excellent**
Comments	**The overall rating should fall between Very Good and Excellent. The strengths of the proposal are: 1) site−specific detail on channel characteristics and riparian vegetation; 2) local landowner and local agency involvement; 3) community involvement with an environmental education program; 4) experience of the project team.** **The main weakness is the lack of development of the conceptual model, but clearly the proponents understand the main interactions and elements of such a model. Some details of the monitoring program need to be fleshed out; that seems appropriate at this stage.**

Bay Regional Panel Review

Proposal Number: 0030

Proposal Name: Selby Creek Stream Habitat Restoration and Riparian Revegetation Project

Applicant Organization: Bioengineering Institute

1. Applicability to ERP goals and regional priorities.

The proposal does provide some measure of ecosystem restoration. The proposed conservation treatments should improve instream habitat conditions for steelhead trout. A good portion of the proposal calls for establishment of native riparian habitat. Many stream reach areas of Selby Creek have narrow corridors between farmland and creek channel. Because the soils are coarse and the environment is rather arid, native plant materials will benefit the habitat in general, but will be physically limited in providing optimum shade and riparian cover. Regionally, the project will help to promote restoration of riparian areas in farmlands, and should provide some incentive for grape growers to explore restoration and land stewardship group actions. Because of the limited number of landowners involved, goals will be realized most widely by actions taken by the applicant to publicize the project throughout the region, particularly amongst wine grape producers.

notes:

This has been a successful approach in this area in the past and for this group in particular.

2. Links with other restoration actions.

The project does expand on both past and current restoration investments in the region. It does not represent a totally

unique approach, but furthers the investment by adding a tributary restoration program to other Napa River creeks such as Sulphur, Carneros, Heath, Salvador, Spring, and Chase.

notes:

3. Local circumstances.

The project is both feasible and appropriate to the project site. The Selby Creek landowners group does have an established track record in collaborating on stream restoration measures, and there is some strong indication that that work would be built upon and expanded more widely throughout the reach of stream where landowner involvement has some history of success. There do not appear to be any obvious local constraints for such things as permits and landowner interest and participation.

notes:

Because of arid conditions and coarse soils, establishment of restoration species will be difficult. They will first aim to restore shrubby riparian communities, which they will then build on to establish the overstory. The major challenge for this project is that backyards and vineyards often extend to the creek bank with little room to work with for restoring riparian vegetation. The high value of the land means that incentives to landowners are important. Improvement of bank stabilization is a good incentive for landowner participation and will indirectly lead to improved conditions in stream. This would benefit steelhead populations, although the populations present are limited in size.

4. Local involvement.

According to the proposal, 13 landowners have been active in the Selby Creek landowner group. Agencies and entities such as CA Fish and Game, RCD, and Acorn Soupe, have generally been strong supporters of similar restoration projects, and have lent considerable assistance in planning and implementation. Presumably, landowner communications will be maintained, and local stakeholders will continue to play a strong role in sharing implementation technologies and project results. It would be good to encourage the project proponents to develop some form of brochure or publication to further educational outreach. The Acorn Soupe group and RCD would be 2 very effective vehicles to assist with outreach and information sharing.

notes:

RCD is a supportive co-sponsor of this proposal and is looking for matching funds from Napa County. Positive publicity from this work through organizations such as the WICC website will encourage participation and inspire other such projects.

5. Local value.

Yes. It represents the northern-most stream restoration project of its type in the Napa River Watershed, and should help to encourage the growth and expansion of similar restoration projects in the northern Napa Valley.

notes:

The cost/benefit of this project is high as it would improve an impressive number of stream miles. The applicant also has signed agreements with landowners that are willing to participate.

6. Applicant history.

Yes. I am aware of 2 projects, Chase Creek and Spring Creek, which are group projects the applicant has participated in. To my knowledge, similar restoration work was implemented with reasonable success.

notes:

7. Summary of Overall Panel Discussion and Review

The main focus of this project is to improve bank stability which will lead to instream improvement. There is good incentive for voluntary participation by landowners. Detailed design is proposed from field observations, which will be refined and checked. There is a nice community outreach component.

8. Panel Quality Ranking

Good
notes:

9. Regional Priority Ranking

High
notes:

Environmental Compliance Review

Proposal Number: 0030

Proposal Name: Selby Creek Stream Habitat Restoration and Riparian Revegetation Project

Applicant Organization: Bioengineering Institute

1. Is compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) required for this project?
Yes.

2. Is compliance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) required for this project?
Yes.

3. Does this project qualify for an Exemption or Exclusion under CEQA and NEPA, respectively?
No.

4. Did the applicant correctly identify if CEQA/NEPA compliance was required?
Yes.

5. Did the applicant correctly identify the correct CEQA/NEPA document required for the project?
Yes.

6. Has the CEQA/NEPA document been completed?
No.

7. If the document has not been completed, did the applicant allot enough time to complete the document before the project start date?
Yes.

8. If the document has not been completed, did the applicant allot enough funds to complete it?
Yes.

9. Did the applicant adequately identify other legal or regulatory compliance issues (Incidental Take permits, Scientific Collecting permits, etc,) that may affect the project?
Yes.

Comments:

At the end of the CEQA compliance section, they indicated that this project will be permitted as part of a Regioanl General Permit held by CDFG which includes US Army Corp, NOAA Fisheries, 401 Cert., and USFWS. They did not indicate that these permits were required or obtained in the appropriate boxes.

10. Does the proposal include written permission from the owners of any private property on which project activities are proposed or, if specific locations for project activities are not yet determined, is it likely that permission for access can be obtained?
Yes.

11. Do any of these issues affect the project's feasibility due to significant deficiencies in planning and/or budgeting for legal and regulatory compliance or access to property?
No.

Budget Review

Proposal Number: 0030

Proposal Name: Selby Creek Stream Habitat Restoration and Riparian Revegetation Project

Applicant Organization: Bioengineering Institute

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of the requested support?

Yes.

2. Does the Budget Form include a detailed budget for each task identified on the Task and Deliverables Form and in the proposal text?

Yes.

3. Are the costs associated with each task and deliverable reasonable costs for performing the services?

No.
If no, please explain:

Rental Rates for equipment appear to be high ($188K) recommend comparables or estimates to purchase equipment.

.

4. Is each person (employee, consultant, subcontractor, etc.) identified on the Personnel Form also included on the Budget Form?

Yes.

5. Are there estimated hours and an associated hourly rate of compensation for each person identified on the Personnel, Tasks and Deliverables, and Budget forms?

No.
If no, please explain:

Labor rates for Task 4 appear to be high for seed collection, and revegetation. ($40 and $25 and hour).

6. Does the budget include the benefit rate for all personnel identified on the Personnel and Budget forms?

No.
If no, please explain:

Benefits were included in the personnel cost and the rate was not clearly identified.

7. Are the proposed labor rates comparable to state rates?

No.
If no, please explain:

The labor rates appear to be reasonable (assuming the staff benefits rate is approximately 30%), with the exception of Task 4. The labor rate appears to be high for the tasks identified.

8. Is more than 25% of the work proposed to be performed by subcontractors?

No.
If yes, what is the exact percentage to be performed by subcontractors?

Recommend clarification of line item budget for project management cost. This make effect the % proposed to be subcontracted.

9. Are project management expenses appropriately budgeted?

No.
If no, please explain:

Recommend receiving further clarification of the project management costs.It appears that some of the project management costs may be out−sourced (Selby Creek Watershed Ptr, Napa RCD staff). The line item budget may need to be moved to subcontractor and not personnel as a direct cost.

10. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs? Are indirect rates, if used, appropriately applied?

No.
If no, please explain:

However, overhead rate state is reasonable 5%.

11. Does the proposal adequately explain major expenses? Are the labor rates and other charges proposed reasonable in relation to current state rates?

Yes.

12. For equipment >=$5,000, was a separate worksheet filled out?
Please note: No overhead or indirect rate charges are allowed on the equipment purchases

Yes.

13. Is the purpose for all travel clearly represented in either the proposal itself, or in the Tasks and Deliverable Form?
Please note: Recurring travel costs for a specific task or subtask may be combined into one entry on the Budget Form, but the number of trips and cost for each trip must be clearly represented.

Yes.

14. Are travel and per diem at rates specified by the California Department of Personnel Administration for similar employees?

No.

15. Are other agencies contributing or likely to contribute a share of the projects? costs?

Yes.
If yes, when sufficient information is available, please total the amount of matching funds likely to be provided:

SCWP – $80,467 in-kind WCWP Landownders – $73,127.25 SCWP – $120,000 project tasks Napa County DA Mitigation Funds – $50,000 DFG-completed appliation? – $333,537 NAPA RCD-$7,700 – Total $664,831

16. If the applicant identified cost share or matching funds, are they also described in the text

of the proposal?

Yes.

17. Does the applicant take exception to the standard grant agreement's terms and conditions? If yes, are the approaches the applicant proposes to address these issues a reasonable starting point for negotiation a grant agreement?

Yes.

18. Are there other budget issues or "red flags" that warrant consideration?

Yes.
If yes, please explain:

Recommend reevaluation of entire budget and determine if rental rates are cost effective for the state (vs. purchase) and request comparables. Also recommend closer evaluation of project costs and task completed by technical staff. Rates appear to be higher than average for state rates in some cases.

19. Provide revised amount requested based upon your review:
$

Other comments:

Complete budget narrative was not provided.